

## REMARKS

In response to the outstanding Office Action, applicant canceled claims 1, 2, 6, 10 and 11.

New claim 13, including subject matter of previous claims 1 and 2, has been added in the application.

Claims 13, 3-4 and 5, 7, 8, 9 and 12 are pending in the application.

All the pending claims have amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Dengue, et al.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Degnen et al. (2,548,875) in view of Raterman (5,198,397).

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Degnen in view of Raterman and further in view of Cheng (4,306,888) and Smith (5,314,616).

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Deem in view of Raterman, Cheng and further in view of Smith (5,314,616).

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Degnen in view of Smith (5,314,616).

Claims 9 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Degnen in view of Shah (4,328,353).

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Degnen et al. in view of Raterman and further in view of Tsao (4,243,650).

Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Degnen in view of Raterman and Tsao and further in view of Shah.

Claim 5 as currently amended contains subject matter of claim 6, which has been cancelled.

New claim 13 contains subject matter of previous claims 1 and 2, which have been cancelled.

All the pending claims set forth a process and a device, respectively for oxychlorization of ethylene. Claims 11 and 12 have been canceled accordingly.

No new issues requiring an additional search by the Examiner have been raised in the current amendment. Therefore, entry of this amendment is respectfully requested.

Referring now to the prior art Degnen et al. fails to show or suggest a dome part of the fluidized bed reactor is divided into at least two chambers each having an outlet for a main gas stream to a quench vessel and for a bypass gas stream.

Rateman applied against claim 6 in combination with Degnen et al. teaches a two-stage fluid bed regeneration of catalyst with shared dilute phase, wherein the dome part of the regenerator is not subdivided into chambers either.

Cheng applied against claim 6 in combination with Degnen et al. and Rateman teaches a method for filtering dust from a dust-laden gas stream where cleaning of the filter is accomplished by backflow of gas through the filter wall and axial pulsations of gas along the longitudinal gas of the filter.

The Examiner states that Cheng shows a partition 44 dividing about the baseplate carrying the filter cartridges the dome space into two chambers 46, 48.

No filter cartridges, however, are carried on the plate 34, contrary to the present invention as claimed in claim 5 as amended. Cheng shows filters 40, 42 supported by support means 108,109 (see Fig. 2 and column 3, line 58 to column 4, line 16).

No suggestion of dividing a dome space above the filters is provided in any of the references taken singly or in combination, cited against claim 6, the subject matter of which was included in claim 1.

Cheng discloses a specific method for cleaning filters rather than a fluidized-bed reactor with dippable filter cartridges and one skilled in the art would not arrive at the present invention from the combination of Degnen et al., Raterman and Cheng.

Thus, claim 5 as amended is patentably distinguishable over the prior art and should be allowed.

Claims 7, 8, 9, and 12 dependent upon claim 5 should be also allowed.

Claim 2, the subject matter of which is included in new claim 13 is rejected over Degnen et al. in view of Raterman and further in view of Cheng and Smith.

New independent claim 13 sets forth a method of removing dust particles from a fluidized-bed reactor for oxychlorization of ethylene by removing the dust particles collected in the fluidized-bed reactor via filter cartridges from the reactor, passing a reaction gas mixture from a dome part of the reactor to a quench vessel and removing a partial gas stream as a bypass gas stream in addition to a main gas stream out of the reactor wherein the bypass stream has a predetermined content of dust particles of a size which is smaller than a predetermined particle size.

The Examiner admitted that Degnen and Raterman are silent as to removing a bypass stream from the reactor in addition to a main stream and that Degnen, Raterman and Cheng, taken collectively, are silent as to the bypass stream having a predetermined dust fraction below a predetermined particle size.

As pointed out above Cheng teaches a specific method for cleaning a filter and provides valves 62, 74 and 60, 78 to allow gases to flow from compartment 46 through filter 42 from a downstream to upstream direction. This has little to do with applicant's method requiring passing a reaction gas mixture from a dome part of the reactor to a quench vessel and removing a partial gas stream as a bypass gas stream in addition, to a main gas stream.

Smith teaches a system with an auxiliary bypass filter located on the pressure side of the pump wherein bypass flow path through the auxiliary filter is decreased when the flow demand on the pump is increased.

In other words, in Smith the bypass flow path directly depends on the demand of the pump whereas according to the present invention as claimed the bypass gas stream which is removed from the fluidized bed reactor in addition to the main gas stream has a predetermined content of dust particles of a size smaller than a predetermined particle size.

The applicant's invention relates to removing dust particles from a fluidized-bed reactor whereas Smith suggests using two filters in a filter system for an automatic power transmission mechanism, which has nothing to do with the Degnen and Raterman systems.

Claim 13 as well as claims 3-4 dependent therefrom are allowable over the art.

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,



---

Thomas J. Bean  
Reg. No. 44,528

**CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304**

Katten Muchin Zavis Rosenman  
575 Madison Avenue  
New York, NY 10022-2585  
(212) 940-8800  
Docket No.: 2734/Meinke/US (053735-87543)